

**Appl. No.** : **10/032,042**  
**Filed** : **December 21, 2001**

## **REMARKS**

This paper amends Claims 1, 11, 19 and 22. Claims 2-10, 12-18, 20, 21 and 23 are unchanged. Claims 1-23 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested. The amendments for Claims 1, 11, 19 and 22 are for clarification and are not narrowing.

### Double Patenting

Claims 1-10 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,234. Applicant herewith timely files a terminal disclaimer.

### Discussion of Claim Clarification

Clarified Claim 1, and similarly for Claim 19, recites that the system provides parallel paths for the video cataloger and the video encoders. Similarly, clarified Claim 22 recites means for receiving video information at a video cataloger and at a plurality of digital video encoders via parallel paths within the system. Claim 11 has been clarified to recite that the generating and the encoding are performed in parallel in a system. These features, along with the remaining claim text, are not shown in the prior art.

Furthermore, Applicant recites a plurality of video encoders, each encoder receiving the video information. In certain embodiments, the video information corresponds to a single source. The prior art does not disclose that each recording source is operated on by a plurality of video encoders.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all claims.

### Dependent Claims

Claims 2-10, 12-18, 20-21 and 23 are dependent either directly or indirectly on one of the above-discussed independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶4, the dependent claims incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which

**Appl. No.** : **10/032,042**  
**Filed** : **December 21, 2001**

they refer and include their own patentable features, and are therefore in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of all claim rejections and prompt allowance of the claims.

Conclusion

In light of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are specifically requested. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the above-identified application are in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner finds any impediment to allowing all claims that can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.


Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

2/9/05

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
John M. Carson  
Registration No. 34,303  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550

S:\DOCS\RJS\RJS-8406.DOC 020405

**Appl. No.** : **10/032,042**  
**Filed** : **December 21, 2001**

## **SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

### Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None

### Identification of Claims Discussed

Claims 1, 11, 19 and 22 were discussed.

### Identification of Prior Art Discussed

The prior art of record was discussed.

### Proposed Amendments

Various proposals were discussed.

### Principal Arguments and Other Matters

Applicant's representative explained that the architecture disclosed in Cruz et al., for example, is different than that claimed. The prior art does not show a system having parallel paths for the video encoders and the video cataloger, nor are the generating and the encoding performed in parallel. Applicant's representative explained that the prior art does not disclose and would not have made obvious the claimed invention.

### Results of Interview

The Examiner believed that the independent claims needed to be clarified.